DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mary Valdez,

Plaintiff,

v.

J.P.Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:20-cv-02033-KJM-JDP

SECOND STIPULATION
BETWEEN JPMORGAN CHASE
BANK, N.A. AND MARY VALDEZ
TO EXTEND CHASE'S TIME TO
RESPOND TO THE COMPLAINT
AND ORDER

NEW RESPONSE DATE: January 11, 2021

## Case 2:20-cv-02033-KJM-JDP Document 8 Filed 11/30/20 Page 2 of 2

1	Plaintiff Mary Valdez filed this action on October 12, 2020. Ms. Valdez	
2	served Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. on October 13, 2020, making	
3	Chase's response due on November 3, 2020. Based upon the allegations in the	
4	Complaint, Chase requested and Ms. Valdez initially granted Chase until	
5	December 1, 2020 to investigate the claims, evaluate early settlement, and	
6	determine its response to the Complaint. The parties have preliminarily discussed	
7	settlement and believe that they may be able to reach resolution without further	
8	filings and Court proceedings if Chase has additional time to answer.	
9	The parties stipulate under Local Rule 144, with the Court's approval, that	
10	Chase's time to respond to the Complaint is extended 41 days to January 11, 2021.	
11	This is the second extension Ms. Valdez has granted to Chase. The extension will	
12	not affect any other date in the case.	•
13	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
14	DATED: November 23, 2020	Respectfully submitted,
15		DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
16		By: /s/ Joseph E. Addiego III
17		Joseph E. Addiego III Frederick A. Haist
18		Attorneys for JPMorgan Chase Bank,
19	D. 1	N.A.
20	DATED: November 23, 2020	MARTIN & BONTRAGER, APC
21		By: /s/ G. Thomas Martin, III
22		G. Thomas Martin, III Nicholas J. Bontrager
23		Attorneys for Mary Valdez
24		
25	ORDER	
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
27	DATED: November 30, 2020	MAMMOL.
28		$V \downarrow V \downarrow$

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP